
Remarks

The paragraphs of the Office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner indicated that this action is in response to the applicant's communication filed on 5/14/2003. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
2. The Examiner indicated that claims 31-56 are pending, that claim 31 is the sole independent claim and that claim 31 was amended in Amendment C, and that this action is made Final. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
3. The Examiner indicated that the text of those sections of 35 U.S.C. not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.

Claim Objections

4. The Examiner objected to claim 31 due to a typographical error. The applicant has requested that this typographical error be corrected. The applicant believes that this requested amendment is fully responsive to the objection of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

5. The Examiner provided the citation to the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
6. The Examiner rejected claims 31-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The applicant has requested that the term "deformable" be removed from the claim. The applicant believes that this requested amendment is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

7. The Examiner rejected claims "31–56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. (U.S. patent 5,121,469) in view of Isowaki et al. (Isowaki, US 6,417,854 B1) in view of Schwuttke et al. (Schwuttke, U.S. patent 6,222,547)." The applicant has requested that claim 31, on which claims 32–56 depend and which include all of the limitations of claim 31, be amended as shown to provide further clarity regarding the changes in height and width of the objects provided to show the data interdependency relationships between the data variables in applicant's invention and to make more clear that applicants' invention provides a display of historical objects showing the past "historical" depictions of the objects displayed in this invention. The applicant believes that the combination of elements of the applicant's invention as currently claimed are neither described nor even suggested in the cited or any other known references. The applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the objection of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to Arguments

8. The Examiner indicated that the applicant's arguments with respect to claim 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and does not believe a specific response to this paragraph is required.

Conclusion

9. The Examiner stated that the applicant's amendment necessitated new ground(s) of rejection and that this action is made final. The applicant is responding to this final Office action with a Request for Continued Examination and fees. The applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to this final Office action and respectfully requests continued examination.

10. The Examiner indicated that certain "prior art" is made of record and not relied upon but is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's search and respectfully requests inclusion of these references in the list of cited references.

Inquires

11. The Examiner provided information concerning communication on this application. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assist on this case.

The applicant has requested that claim 31 be amended as previously described. Since claims 32-56 are dependent on claim 31 and incorporate its limitations, the applicant believes that this requested amendment fully addresses the rejections to claims 32-56 as well. Applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been addressed. Applicant believes that claims 31-56 are patentable over all known prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of November, 2003.



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 532-1234
Facsimile: (801) 536-6111